



---

St. Clement of Ochrida

Author(s): Methodie Kusseff

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 27, No. 68 (Dec., 1948), pp. 193-215

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4204008>

Accessed: 12/06/2014 17:18

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## ST. CLEMENT OF OCHRIDA

IN the year A.D. 869 a small council was held in Constantinople known in the west as the eighth œcumenical council. Towards its close in 870 the emissaries of Knyas (Prince) Boris of Bulgaria arrived and were placed next to the delegation of the Franks. They were not given a hearing until the end of the council at a special session called by the emperor Basil I. At this meeting the Bulgarians said that their King had sent them to ask the following question: "cui Ecclesiæ subdi debemus?"<sup>1</sup> In the subsequent lengthy discussion the Eastern Patriarchs maintained that Bulgaria must come under the jurisdiction of Byzantium and not the Pope, because until the coming of the Bulgarians to the Balkans the land belonged to this Patriarchate and the Bulgarians first received the Christian faith from the East and not from the West.

Immediately after the close of the session and in spite of the vigorous protests of the papal legates, Ignatius Patriarch of Constantinople appointed an archbishop<sup>2</sup> and, together with several bishops and many priests, sent him to Bulgaria. This was one of the most significant events in Bulgarian history. From that time the country was to belong to the East, which was her natural home.

<sup>1</sup> Anastasius Bibliothecarius kept the minutes of this session:—Vita Adriani ii, Migne *Patrologia Lat.*, t. 128, pp. 1391 ff., also Anastasii Interpretat. Synodi VIII general. præfatio—Migne, t. 139, pp. 18 ff.

<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to know what was his exact ecclesiastical position. E. Golubinsky (*Kratki Ocherk Istorii Pravoslavnykh Tserkvey*, pp. 254–56) has an interesting note in this connection. He points out that in the West Archbishop and Metropolitan meant the same thing, but not in the East where there were two categories of Archbishops below and above the Metropolitan. Those below were directly responsible to the Patriarch, though they were in dioceses of Metropolitans. The latter were completely independent even of the Patriarch—being below them only in title and not in function. Golubinsky reasons that since the Bulgarian Church could not have the first type and since it is doubtful that they had the latter, they probably had a Metropolitan who was called Archbishop, since the Pope had promised an archbishop to Knyas Boris. But it seems that the Bulgarian Archbishop must have been completely independent in his home affairs since that was one of the main demands of the Bulgarian Knyas. He must also have had some special privileges because he was appointed to a place next to the Patriarch in Constantinople. Professor Zlatarsky finds proof that he must have had complete autonomy at home, in the title *antistes* (an overseer, bishop) (*Istoria na Pervoto Bulgarsho Tsarstvo*, V, I, Part 2, p. 148). Hadrian II uses this title in his letter to Basil, referring to the Bulgarian Archbishop: "videlicet quia favore vestro frater et cœpiscopus noster Ignatius in Bulgarorum regione consecrare præsumpsit *antistilem*, unde mirati sumus" (namely, because by your favour our brother and co-bishop Ignatius has presumed to consecrate a bishop in the land of the Bulgarians, at which we are astonished—Migne *Patr. Lat.* t. 122, col. 1310 C.). Professor Zlatarsky states that this designation was given not to Metropolitans but to the leaders of separate Churches and to Patriarchs.

Unfortunately I have not been able to confirm this meaning of "Antistes."

Boris had turned in 866 to the Pope because Byzantium even refused to give him bishops. He soon realised that his dream of an independent hierarchy, subject to himself, would never come true from Rome. He also realised that the Holy See would never allow the secular authorities to interfere with Church matters. In addition to this the Latin language was less familiar to his subjects than Greek and finally, since Rome herself had lost her glory after 410, she could not impress the emissaries of the Barbarian Khan. The position was entirely different with regard to Byzantium; she was the Mistress of the World, renowned for her magnificence, wealth and power, all the barbarians who knew her dreamt of her elegance, luxury and culture. The squares were full of beautiful statues and here also stood the Church of St. Sofia—the wonder of the world. Its attractive power is well illustrated by the story of the Russian legend concerning the emissaries of Khan Vladimir, who were sent to choose the best religion. When they reported to their people on their attendance at a service in St. Sofia they said: “We did not know whether we were on earth or in Heaven.”

But Boris must have been far more impressed by the aureole which surrounded the Basileus. He was called *δεσπότης, αὐτοκράτωρ τῶν Ρωμαίων*—the absolute sovereign whose subjects were merely called the *δοῦλοι τῆς Βασιλείας*. The Basileus was the viceroy of God, and as such supreme both in spiritual and material matters. Certainly Boris had something to admire. He himself was a barbarian Khan surrounded by turbulent boyars and was even in his own court only *primus inter pares*. By means of Christianity he wished to become equal to the Cæsars of the Eastern empire. As a first step he needed a Patriarch at Pliska (his capital) and in the new Archbishop he almost realised his dream. For his second step—the centralisation of authority—he based his whole policy on the Slav element in his kingdom. Bulgaria was a sovereign state but it did not possess the characteristics of a nation, i.e. common descent, language and history. It was composed of two different races: a vigorous minority of Asiatic Bulgars—with their boyars, and a large homogeneous mass of Slavs. By relying entirely on the Slav element Boris intended to break the influence of these powerful boyars, and gradually to achieve the supremacy of a Basileus. But for all this he needed the new and powerful unifying force, which he found in Christianity. Surrounded on the east and on the west by two Christian nations with well-advanced cultures, he realised the weakness and danger of his pagan kingdom, based as it was on force alone. Under the rule of a weak khan this large dominion could

fall to pieces. Being a wise diplomat he realised the importance of the unifying force of Christianity in binding the two races together by a common culture, and thus achieving the creation of a Bulgarian nation. Since the tribe of the Asiatic Bulgars was a minority among the Slav element, Boris aimed at its submergence and gradual disappearance. His work succeeded so well in this direction that "today we find there are no traces of the Bulgars in the old and new Slav-Bulgarian language apart from its name and a few words."<sup>3</sup>

With the arrival of the Archbishop the Latin clergy left Bulgaria after they had worked in a thorough way for three years. Pope Hadrian II was naturally greatly upset, and for a long time after this event he and his successors John VIII and Marinus tried to recover their influence in Bulgaria—but in vain. Boris "sent gifts to the Popes and paid his respects, but did not answer their letters." He had decided to remain faithful to Byzantium.

The newly arrived Greek clergy began their work and received every assistance from the Bulgarian ruler. Naturally all the services were held in Greek, which was also the official language.<sup>4</sup> Boris must have been aware of the difficulty facing his subjects, namely that in order to understand Christianity either they had to learn Greek or the service had to be spoken in Slav and Bulgarian. The first idea was not very attractive because, if it succeeded, it meant the hellenisation of his people and the gradual absorption of his kingdom into the Empire. For the fulfilment of the other alternative however he needed a Slavonic hierarchy and books, which at that time simply did not exist in Bulgaria. There was no written Slav literature because there was no alphabet. Boris was content for the present to organise his church so that later on, when he had the necessary trained Slav priests, he could substitute them for the Greeks. That he had this idea in mind is seen in a letter of Photius<sup>5</sup> to the Higurene Arsenius, in which he recommends to him Bulgarians who intended to become monks. By this means the Bulgarian ruler probably intended to prepare bishops of Bulgarian origin, but this was only a drop in the large Slavonic ocean. The Greeks had also prepared local clergy for the minor appointments, although we see from *Vita S. Clementis* that many of them scarcely understood Greek "knowing only how to read the Greek letters."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> B. Tsonev, *Istoria na Bulgarski ezik.*, Sofia, 1919, pp. 11–12.

<sup>4</sup> This has been proved by the Pliska excavations.

<sup>5</sup> Photius, *Ep.* XCV, pp. 904–5.

<sup>6</sup> *Migne Patr. Cur. compl. Gr.*, v. 126, p. 1229. "καὶ ἱερεῖς δὲ πολλοὺς βουλγάρους δυσὲν ἔχοντας τῶν γραικικῶν ὧν περὶ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν μονὴν ἐνετρίβησαν γράμμασι."

What Boris needed was a huge Slavonic educational centre, where the books could be translated and Bulgarians trained for teachers and priests, thus gradually preparing the way for the introduction of Slavonic not only in the church but also as the official language in the state. Unlike Rome, Byzantium took a generous attitude towards the worship of God in native tongues, and Boris had nothing to fear so far as a Slavonic liturgy was concerned. Officially Byzantium never forbade the Slavonic worship. It allowed Syrians, Ethiopians, Armenians and others to introduce the liturgy in their own tongue and even showed a certain favour to the Slavonic language. Thus with the blessing of both the Emperor Michael III and the Patriarch Photius, Cyril and Methodius were sent to Moravia taking with them the Slavonic alphabet.

Unfortunately their important work and in particular that of Methodius was gradually destroyed. After his death some of his disciples were sold as slaves and taken to Venice. Here once again Byzantium showed its sympathy with the Slavonic cause. At that time an emissary of Basil I came to Venice, and, seeing the slaves, bought them and took them with him to Constantinople where they were reinstated as priests and deacons and where "they gave lessons." <sup>7</sup> Later on they were sent to Bulgaria and Boris received them with a great welcome. Moreover this Bulgarian ruler gave an even greater welcome to other Slavonic teachers expelled from Moravia, among them one of the greatest Slavonic teachers—St. Clement of Ochrida. It was he who laid the foundation of a Slavonic literature by means of which the Slav world was able to assimilate the fruits of the intellectual and artistic culture of Byzantium, especially at the time of its renaissance. Thus, although the great mission for the enlightenment of the Slavs was doomed to failure in Moravia, it found a new and more fruitful ground among the Bulgarian Slavs: and they were able, later on, to hand on their achievements to other nations.

Although St. Clement had rendered so great a service to the Slavonic world this was not recognised until the 19th century <sup>8</sup> when Czech and Russian slavists became aware of it. Our main source for his life is the *Vita S. Clementis* in the Greek original, usually attributed to Theophylact, Archbishop of Ochrida. Other sources of far less significance are:—the shorter Life of S. Clement (in Greek), his Slavonic service, and fragmentary evidence found in

<sup>7</sup> The *Vita S. Naoum* in *Bulgariski stariny.*, Prof. I. Ivanov, p. 306. This implies that there must have been a Slavonic School at Constantinople in existence.

<sup>8</sup> *Sv. Kliment Ochridsky*, by A. Teodorov-Balan, akademichna riech, p. 36.

various places.<sup>9</sup> The *Vita S. Clementis* is a most valuable historical document although it has been severely criticised<sup>10</sup> for some of the inconsistencies and contradictions with which it abounds.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, in spite of this it provides us with useful information about Cyril and Methodius, which is confirmed by other historical evidence, particularly connected with their visit to Rome; the death of Cyril; the work of Methodius in Moravia and his struggle with the German clergy. After the death of Methodius and the expulsion of his disciples the author concentrates entirely on the work of Clement in Bulgaria. He states the historical facts but frequently interprets them to suit his own ideas. His handling of his sources is very free, he includes long speeches and prayers of pronounced eloquence written in accordance with the existing rules of hagiography. His main misinterpretation is found, I think, when he takes the whole weight of the crucial question concerning the use of the Slavonic liturgy in Moravia and places it solely on the basis of a struggle between the disciples of Methodius and the German clergy over the doctrinal question of the Filioque clause, a subject in which the author shows great interest.<sup>12</sup> When we reach his narrative concerning Clement we find a more factual and historical approach, and it is this section that makes the whole work so valuable.

As for the existing text of the *Vita S. Clementis*, we find parts of it in: (a) fragments; (b) in full; and (c) in revised modern Greek versions. (a) consists of a small fragment found in the Vatican library and printed by Leo Allatius<sup>13</sup> in Rome in 1665. With certain abbreviations this is also found in the collection of

<sup>9</sup> In referring to sources and their various additions I shall, unless otherwise stated, chiefly follow N. L. Tunitsky, *Sv. Kliment episcop Slovensky*.

<sup>10</sup> E. E. Golubinsky (*Sviety Constantin i Metodi*, p. 54) goes so far as to call its author an "ignorant and impudent Greek forger" who even lived after Theophylact.

<sup>11</sup> These will be discussed later when we consider the text.

<sup>12</sup> Here I agree with Tunitsky, though I am aware of other interpretations.

We must admit in fairness to the writer that in a passage of the *Vita Methodii* it is said that the enemies of Methodius stirred up some of those infected with the *υιοπατωρ* (abbrev. of *υιου και πατρος* = *εκ πατρος και υιου*) heresy, and influenced the weaker brethren, making them turn from the true way (*Vita Methodii*, p. 76, *Trudi slavienskoy komissii.*, Vol. I, Leningrad, 1930). He may have taken the hint from here and developed the theme to great length.

<sup>13</sup> In Robert Creighton (pp. 259-62) he calls the writer "an author of considerable antiquity" and states that "he is schismatic and an adherent to the belief of the procession of the spirit from the Father alone." He later on refers to him as "this same anonymous author." Three passages are cited: the first begins, *Ἦν γὰρ ὁ βορίσσης* (actually written *βορίλας*) *οὗτος . . .* and ends *ἡ τοῦτου τοῦ γένος κλήσις γεγέννηται* (from Ch. 4). The second begins: *Τὸ δὲ τῶν αἱρετικῶν σύστημα . . .* ends *φημί, πάντα συγχωρεῖν* (from Ch. 5). The third begins: *τούτον μὲν τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς . . .* ends *κολάδι ἐπικλινόμενος* (from Ch. 7). After each quotation follows a Latin translation. The Greek is almost unintelligible.

manuscripts on Mount Athos.<sup>14</sup> (b) The full text has had several editions.<sup>15</sup> Two of them were independent of each other, but probably all of them were based on or connected with a common manuscript coming from the monastery of S. Nahum near Ochrida. The revised modern Greek editions come from an ancient monastery of the Prodomos now in ruins, lying south of Veria on the river Veritza in Northern Greece. It was said that the head of Clement was stolen from Ochrida and brought to this monastery. Later on this led to the cult of this same saint. Two editions were prepared and published by a learned monk-priest Athanasius Paroski.<sup>16</sup> In them he introduced some new material concerning the origin of Clement, the baptism of the Bulgarians and the lives of Cyril and Methodius.<sup>17</sup> From the many variations existing in Athanasius' text of the *Vita*, it seems that he possessed another source on which he based his editions. From what has been said above it is clear that at the base of all existing editions of the *Vita S. Clementis* there are three independent manuscripts: (a) from the monastery of St Nahum, (b) from Ochrida, and (c) that used by Athanasius Paroski. None of these can be taken as the archetype.

The authorship of the *Vita S. Clementis* presents a formidable problem. In most existing manuscripts the name of Theophylact, Archbishop of Ochrida, is mentioned; but it was a well-known device of ancient writers to attribute a written work to a great name in order that it might receive greater weight. Almost the whole work is written in the third person but, in some places, the

<sup>14</sup> *Catalogue of the Greek MSS. on Mt. Athos*, Cambridge U.P., 1895.

v. 1. 3808. 274 *χαρτ* xvi 107 (p 500a).

v. 1. 3814. 280 *χαρτ* xvi 13 (p 358).

v. 2. 4502. 382 *χαρτ* xv 106, 105 (p 681a-678b).

<sup>15</sup> (a) Moschopoli edition of 1741, published by two Greek monks, Michael Gores and Gregory Constantinidis. (Moskopolis is in South Albania, north-west of Koritsa) (b) The Vienna edition of 1802, published by Ambrosius Pampereus. (c) Miklosich edition of 1847, published by F. Miklosich. Here for the first time *Vita S. Clementis* is divided into 29 chapters. This text is re-edited in (d), (e), (f), and (g). (d) Migne *Patrologiæ, cursus completus series græca.*, v. 126, pp. 1194-1240 with Latin translation (pub. 1864). This text I have used. (e) Moscow university edition of 1855. *Materialia dlia istorii pismen.* It is provided with a Russian translation. (f) Czech edition of 1873. *Fontes rerum bohemicarum*, ed. V. Novotný, I, pp. 76-92. (g) Bilbassov—*Codex legendarum de SS. Cyrillo et Methodio*, v. 11, 1871, Tunitsky (*S. Kliment . . . ibid.*, p. 13) mentions two more manuscripts of the *Vita S. Clementis* found in Ochrida, one of which is preserved in the Rumiantzov museum in Russia. This last is important from the standpoint of textual criticism, since it gives some variants of the common text and probably has an independent source. I shall refer to it as the Moscow MS.

<sup>16</sup> (a) *Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν κλήμεντος Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Βουλγαρίας*, etc. (b) *Οὐρανοῦ Κρίσις*, etc. 1805. Of (b) two more editions appeared in 1807 and in 1850 (Athens).

<sup>17</sup> Tunitsky (*Sv. Kliment . . . op. cit.*, p. 26).



author speaks of himself as an intimate disciple of Clement, and this cannot have been true of Theophylact.

ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς ταπεινοὺς καὶ ἀναξίους οἰκειοτέρους τῶν ἄλλων διὰ σπλάγχνα τῆς χρηστότητος ἐποιήσατο, καὶ πάντοτε συνῆμεν αὐτῷ πᾶσι παρακολούθουντες οἷς ἐποιεῖται, οἷς ἔλεγεν, οἷς δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἐδίδασκεν (Ch. 18).

(Although we are lowly and unworthy, because of his love and goodness he made us more intimate with him than others and we were always with him, following him in everything that he did and said and in what he taught both in word and deed.)<sup>18</sup>

But if the writer has said that he was always with Clement, how is it possible for him to speak later on in Ch. 22 of St. Clement's works as follows :

Φέρονται γὰρ ταῦτα πάντα παρὰ τοῖς φιλοπόνοις σωζόμενα,

(It is said that all this has been preserved by diligent people.)<sup>19</sup>

It seems as if he knew of his master's works only from hearsay. Then in Ch. 23 he speaks of Clement building for himself a monastery in Ochrida, to which was joined another church

ἦν ἕστερον ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς θρόνον ἔθεντο.

(which subsequently became the archiepiscopal see.)<sup>19</sup>

As Ochrida did not become an archbishopric until the reign of the Bulgarian king Samuel in 1014-15, the writer must have lived one hundred years later than Clement, who died in 916.<sup>20</sup> It is very clear that, as the text of the *Vita* stands, it could not have been written by a pupil of St. Clement. The best illustration lies however in a comparison of its pompous style with the simplicity of the *Vita S. Naoum*, written in Slavonic by a pupil of Clement. Both writers refer to the tragic event of the torture and expulsion of the pupils of Methodius from Moravia, yet there is a great difference in expression. *Vita S. Clementis*, Ch. XIII : <sup>21</sup>

Μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἀπαναθρώπους ἐκεῖνας πληγὰς μηδὲ τροφῆς μεταλαβεῖν τοὺς ἁγίους παραχωρήσαντες · οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶων οὐδένα τοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ δούλοις, μᾶλλον δὲ χριστοῖς, προσρέπτειν οὐδὲ ἄρτον κλασμάτιον, ἀλλὰ στρατιώταις ἀπάγειν ἄλλον ἄλλαχού τῶν παρὰ τοῦ Ἰστροῦ μερῶν παρέδωκαν, τὴν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἀειφνυῖαν τῶν οὐρανοπολιτῶν καταψηφισάμενοι.

<sup>18</sup> Patr. G., *ibid.*, c. 1225.

<sup>19</sup> Patr. G., *ibid.*, c. 1229.

<sup>20</sup> Further blunders of the writer will be discussed in the text.

<sup>21</sup> Patr. G., *ibid.*, c. 1217.



(After these inhuman tortures they did not allow the saints to partake of food, or anyone else to throw a crust of bread to the servants of Christ, or rather the anointed ones, but handed them to the soldiers to be taken away to different parts of the region near the Danube, thus condemning the citizens of Heaven to eternal banishment from the city.)

*Vita S. Naoum* : <sup>22</sup>

Исе же вѣдомо боуди всѣмъ почитающоу Якоже прѣжде напѣсахѡ. Яко еретѣци овы моучише много. А ароугые продаше жидом на цѣнѣ презвітеры ѣ діакони. Ты же жидове поѣмше и вѣдоше къ веньткомъ, и вьнегда продахоу е по строенію вожію.

(And let this be known to all who esteem him, as I have written before, that the heretics (*sc.* the German clergy) tortured these men (S. Clement and S. Nahum) much and others—priests and deacons who were sold to the Jews at a price. All those the Jews took and brought to Venice and then they sold them according to Divine Providence.) <sup>23</sup>

Both writers also refer to the appointment of Clement as bishop.  
*Vita S. Clementis*, Ch. XX : <sup>24</sup>

Μετά ταῦτα τοῖς συνετωτέροις τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν σκόπῃσας, οἱ πάντες ὡς πατρὶ προσεῖχον τῷ Κλήμεντι τοῦτο μόνον ἀρέσκειν θεῷ, ὃ τιμῶσι τοῦτον, πιστεύοντες, ἐπίσκοπος Δρεμβίτζας ἦτοι βελίτζας προβάλλεται, καὶ οὕτω δὴ Βουλγάρῳ γλώσσῃ πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος ὁ Κλήμης καθίσταται.

(After this, (Simeon) took council with the wise around him, who were devoted to Clement as to a father, and believed that this thing only is acceptable to God, that they honour him and he was promoted to be bishop of Drembitza or Belitza and thus Clement became the first Bulgarian-speaking bishop.)

*Vita S. Naoum* : <sup>25</sup>

Егда поставише епископа Климента. Тъждѣ благовѣрнѣи царь сѣмеѡнъ, поустѣ наоума подроуга емоу въ него мѣсто на оучѣтелство.

(After he appointed Clement to be bishop, the same faithful King Simeon allowed Nahum, the friend of Clement, to teach on his stead.)

Throughout the *Vita S. Naoum* there is a simplicity and freshness of style which reminds the reader of the Gospel of S. Mark. The writer of the *Vita S. Clementis* could not have been a pupil of

<sup>22</sup> I. Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

<sup>23</sup> This is confirmed by the *Vita S. Clementis* : Patr. G., *ibid.*, c. 1213 and c. 1216, Ch. 11 : “Ὅσοι δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων ἦσαν νεώτεροι, τοὺτους δὴ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐπώλουν.” (“Those of the priests and deacons who were younger they sold to the Jews.”)

<sup>24</sup> Patr. G., *ibid.*, c. 1228.

<sup>25</sup> I. Ivanov, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

S. Clement either from the linguistic or the historical point of view ; nevertheless he used as one of his sources a work most probably written by a pupil of Clement. When we read " We " passages in the Greek, they remind us very much of the Slavonic *Vita S. Naoum*. Moreover there are passages in the latter which strongly suggest that the same author also wrote a *Vita* of his master. One of these passages has already been cited above.

What is more, the *Vita S. Naoum* begins : <sup>26</sup>

И се же брѣтіе да не останаѣть везъ пѣмѣти, брат сѣго бѣженнаго Климента.

(Brethren, this is (now written) in order that the brother of this blessed Clement may not remain without remembrance.)

This seems strongly to imply that, before beginning the actual story of Naoum, the writer had finished one on Clement. Throughout the *Vita S. Naoum* he speaks of them both as " our spiritual fathers."

The difficulty arising here is this : why did the well-educated Greek writer, who revised so carefully his other sources, leave untouched the few " we " passages ? Various suggestions <sup>27</sup> might be put forward but no definite answer can be arrived at.

When we read the *Vita S. Clementis* our first impression suggests that the writer is a man of letters who knows the rules of hagiography. His knowledge of the Slavonic world is very poor indeed. As a result of his great culture he is very severe on the Bulgarian Slavs, who were to him still savages and their khans barbarians. Yet, in spite of this, he defends the Bulgarian cause. From what has been said can we not venture the view that this informed writer is Theophylact, Archbishop of Ochrida, who through the *Vita* is defending the independence of his see from the encroachment of the Patriarch in Byzantium ? In suggesting this, we are holding to the traditional view ; and, as we have seen above, most of the manuscripts bear after the title the name of Theophylact. If we accept this verdict we can date the work as being written at the end of the 11th or the beginning of the 12th century.

*The Shorter Life of Clement*.<sup>28</sup>—This document is much shorter

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>27</sup> Such as that there was more than one author ; or that they were translated and introduced into the text by later editors or even introduced by the writer himself, as was the common practice.

<sup>28</sup> *Some of the publications are :* (a) 'Ακολουθία τῶν ἁγίων ἐπταρίθμων. (b) The MS. of V. I. Grigorovich, found in 1845 at Ochrida, dated 13th-14th century. (c) Prof. S. Safarik published it with Latin trans. MS. given to him by Prof. Kurtzien. (d) The Greek with Slavonic trans. I. Ivanov : *Bulgariski Starini*. (e) *Μέγας συναξαριστής πάντων τῶν ἁγίων* (ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1896).

and is based on the *Vita S. Clementis*. In it there are many historical blunders,<sup>29</sup> such as Michael (Boris took this name at his baptism) being the son of Boris instead of Simeon ; Clement being made bishop of the whole Illyricum, etc.

The most important new evidence in it concerns a new script : <sup>30</sup>

ἐσοφίσατο δὲ καὶ χαρακτηρὰς ἐτέρους γραμμάτων πρὸς τό σαφέστερον,  
ἢ οὓς ἔξευρεν ὁ σοφὸς Κύριλλος. . . .

(He thought out other characters for greater clearness than those which the wise Cyril had invented.)

This passage usually raises the formidable problem of the Cyrillic and Glagolitic alphabets. The question will not be discussed here.<sup>31</sup>

*The Service Dedicated to Clement.*<sup>32</sup>—From the evidence found in it we see that Theophylact and Dimitrii Homatian composed part of it. From the historical point of view it has very little value, since the few historical facts which it contains have been taken from the *Vita S. Clementis*.

*Fragmentary Evidence about Clement found in Various Sources.*—The most important of these is the *Vita S. Naoum* written by a pupil of Clement in the 10th century, which is “ of itself the continuation of the lost Slavonic text of the *Vita S. Clementis*.” <sup>33</sup> A reference to Clement is made in *Assemovo Evangelie*,<sup>34</sup> *Uspenie Kirila* <sup>35</sup> and in the Greek catalogue of the first Bulgarian archbishop.<sup>36</sup> There were also many traditions existing in Macedonia about Clement and as a result there are many legends about his life.

The *Vita S. Clementis* can be divided into three parts : (a) General introduction to Cyril and Methodius, their invention of the Slavonic script, the journey to Rome and the death of Cyril ; (b) The work of Methodius in Moravia, his death and the events leading up to the expulsion of his pupils from the country (5–13) ; (c) The life and work of Clement in Bulgaria (14–29).

<sup>29</sup> In his *History of the First Bulgarian Empire*, p. 238, Note 2, Runciman says that “ It is generally recognised now as valueless.”

<sup>30</sup> *Bulgarski Starini*—Prof. Ivanov, pp. 320–21.

<sup>31</sup> See Minns, *St. Cyril really knew Hebrew*. Runciman accepts this view. There is a delightful illustration of the two alphabets in *The Byzantine Patriarchate*, p. 137, by G. Every. On the other hand F. Dvorník in *Slaves, Byzance et Rome* (p. 318) suggests the view that Cyril invented the Glagolik, which was reformed by Clement and replaced by the scholars of the Preslav School.

<sup>32</sup> We possess : Moschopoli edition, 1742, Venetian edition, 1784, and Balaschev's edition with Slavonic translations.

<sup>33</sup> H. L. Tunitsky—*S. Kliment. ibid.*, p. 101.

<sup>34</sup> 11th-century document.

<sup>35</sup> Ancient document.

<sup>36</sup> 12th-century document.

(a) In the first part the writer has used Slavonic lives of Cyril and Methodius, known as the Panonnian legends, but so freely that he produces an entirely new work. The simple and sincere language is replaced by a pompous style used for the purpose of serving the author's own ends and not historical truth. In addition to the Panonnian legend he must have used a Bulgarian source also.

The full title of *Vita S. Clementis* is:—

*Βίος και πολιτεία, ομολογία τε και μερικὴ Θαυμάτων διηγήσις του εν αγίοις πατρός ημών Κλημεντος αρχιεπισκοπου* <sup>37</sup> *Βουλγαρων συγγραφεὺς παρὰ τοῦ ἀγιοτάτου καὶ δοιδίμου ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς Πρώτης Ἰουστινιανῆς και πάσης Βουλγαρίας, κυρίου Θεοφυλακτοῦ, και μαϊστορος τῶν ῥητόρων χρηματίσαντος ἐν Κωνσταντίνου πόλει.*<sup>38</sup>

(The Life and Confession of our Holy Father among the Saints, Clement Archbishop of the Bulgarians, written by the most Holy Archbishop of First Justiniana and all Bulgaria, Theophylact of blessed memory who was former Professor of Rhetoric in Constantinople.)

Theophylact begins his work with a biography of Cyril and Methodius but he does not write about their early life—especially the brilliant career of the younger brother at Constantinople or anything about their subsequent activities. There is no mention of the first deputation to the Saracens led by Cyril or the second to the land of the Chazars in Russia led by both brothers, where they successfully refuted the doctrines of the Jews and the Muslims and found the relics of S. Clement of Rome.

The *Vita S. Clementis* begins with a long and eloquent introduction in which the writer wishes to stress that in spite of what many people think there can still be found—at his time—men of saintly character. He quotes as examples Methodius, Archbishop of Moravia, and Cyril the philosopher.<sup>39</sup>

Because “the Slavonic or the Bulgarian people” (τῶν Σθλοβενῶν γένος εἶτ’ οὗν Βουλγάρων) could not understand the Greek scriptures they

ἐξευρίσκουσι μὲν τὰ σθλοβενικά γράμματα, ἐρμηνεύουσι δὲ τὰς Θεοπνεύστους Γραφὰς ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος γλώσσης εἰς τὴν Βουλγαρικὴν.

<sup>37</sup> Later addition. Ochrida MS. has “ἐπισκοπον” also in Ch. XX. “πρώτος ἐπίσκοπος,” “Bishop Clement” in the *Vita S. Naoum*, see above. In all his sermons he is called also bishop.

<sup>38</sup> Patr. G., *ibid.*, 1194.

<sup>39</sup> In two respects the writer here differs from the Pannonian legends. (a) He gives greater significance to Methodius throughout the *Vita S. Clementis*, making Cyril his subordinate whilst the opposite is true whilst Cyril is alive. (b) All the time he calls the younger brother, Cyril whilst the Pannonian legends call him Constantine and state that only before his death he assumed the name of Cyril together with the monastic garment. We shall use the name of Cyril, since he is usually known by this name amongst the Slavs.

(invent the Slavonic letters and translate the Divinely inspired scriptures from the Greek into the Bulgarian tongue.)

Thus we see that the writer directly connects the activity of the two brothers with Bulgaria. Referring to other contemporary sources we find this statement to be untrue. This story concerning the invention of the alphabet and the direct translation of the scriptures into Bulgarian is either taken from another Bulgarian source or invented by the author to serve his own purpose. An entirely different picture is given to us by the Pannonian legends. According to them the Moravian Prince Rostislav sent emissaries to Michael III to ask for missionaries.<sup>40</sup> The Prince, having an independent kingdom, most probably did not like the interference of the German clergy. By applying to Constantinople (we can perhaps infer from the legend that he first approached the Pope) for teachers he intended to have an independent church. After receiving this request the Emperor persuaded Cyril to undertake this new mission.

In order to preach the gospel with success in Moravia, Cyril needed not only the spoken but also the written word, and for this reason he prepared the Slav alphabet and translated the gospels. In this work he was helped by collaborators. The mission went to Moravia in 862–863 and on the way Cyril collected his brother Methodius. Thus we see that the activities of the two brothers were connected with the Moravian and not the Bulgarian Slavs.<sup>41</sup> According to the Pannonian legends they received a great welcome from Rostislav on their arrival and immediately began their evangelising work. In this they encountered opposition from the German clergy. Some work of this kind had been done previously in Moravia by the dioceses of Salzburg and Passau and they did not like the intruders, especially as the existing priests and deacons were of German origin and directly responsible to these dioceses. The root cause of this problem was the Slavonic liturgy. In the West, unlike the East, the ecclesiastical language remained Latin, and the German clergy defended this by saying that God should be worshipped only in Latin, Hebrew and Greek, since these were the tongues in which the inscription on the cross was written.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Patr. G., *ibid.*, c. 1196.

<sup>41</sup> This evidence of Theophylact may, however, be partly true, since the philologists generally agree that the alphabet prepared by S. Cyril and the books translated into it were based on the Macedonian Slav dialect. At that time Macedonia was part of the Bulgarian kingdom and thus the writer may well have loosely called those Slavs and their language Bulgarian.

<sup>42</sup> This is known as the three *tongue* heresy.

The two brothers spent over three years in Moravia and trained many pupils for the priesthood but it was impossible to persuade the German bishops to ordain them. So Cyril and Methodius left the country, maybe with the hope that they could achieve this by approaching the Italian Archbishop of Venice. On their way to him they stayed a while in Pannonia, whose Prince Kocel gave them fifty pupils to be trained. When the brothers arrived in Venice, instead of ordaining their disciples, the Archbishop called together an assembly of bishops and priests, in front of whom he asked the brothers how they had dared to translate the Scriptures into the Slavonic language. Cyril answered that if God was to be preached in all languages then He ought also to be glorified in them all. A little later Pope Nicholas called the brothers to Rome and they, responding to this call, took with them the relics of Clement of Rome. All these facts are omitted by the writer of the *Vita S. Clementis*. After mentioning the translation of the scripture into Bulgarian he makes a very cryptic remark (Ch. 3) :

Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ Παῦλον ἐγίνωσκον τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον κοινωσάμενον, τρέχουσι καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸς τὸν Ῥώμης, τῷ μακαρίῳ Πάπᾳ τὸ ἐρῶν τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῶν Γραφῶν ἐμφανίσοντες.<sup>43</sup>

(Since they knew that Paul communicated his gospel to the apostles, they hastened to the Blessed Pope of Rome to show him their work of the translation of the scriptures.)

It is clearly seen that according to the author the brothers go to the Pope of their own accord : and in the lines that follow, Theophylact excels so much in his oratory that he makes Pope Hadrian <sup>44</sup> come out and meet them in state, not because they carried the relics with them, but because he had heard of their fame. However, he is in full agreement with the Slav sources which state that the Pope approved of the Slavonic books <sup>45</sup> and arranged for some of their pupils to be ordained as priests and deacons. It is most probable that Clement, who was one of the outstanding pupils, was ordained priest at this time. This was a real success for the two brothers because their evangelising work could not advance unless they had priests to celebrate the liturgy in Slavonic. Theophylact states that Methodius was now consecrated bishop by the Pope, <sup>46</sup> but according

<sup>43</sup> Patr. G., *ibid.*, c. 1196.

<sup>44</sup> Nicholas had died before the arrival of S. Cyril and S. Methodius in Rome.

<sup>45</sup> This is confirmed also by *Translatio S. Clementis*.

<sup>46</sup> By making this concession the Pope probably intended to make them missionaries to the remaining pagan Slavs, and through them, to attract the Slav masses to the see of Rome.

to the *Vita S. Methodii* he was only ordained priest at this time and, later on, the Pope consecrated him bishop when he was sent to Rome by Kocel. Concerning Cyril all sources agree that he "assumed monastic habit" (τὸ τῶν μοναχῶν σχῆμα ἐπαμφιέννεται *monachorum habitum induit*—

въ святыи ино́чскыи образъ обѣтъкъся)

and after a short while he died and was buried there.

In the second part of the *Vita S. Clementis* we again find many inconsistencies and contradictions but in spite of this the main historical events are depicted correctly. In addition to the Pannonian legend he has used a Bulgarian source.

According to the *Vita S. Methodii*, Methodius was sent, at the invitation of Kocel, not only to Pannonia but to all the surrounding Slav countries.<sup>47</sup> As a priest Methodius could not consecrate his Slavonic pupils nor could he succeed in convincing the Bishop of Salzburg to do so for him and therefore, at the request of Kocel, he was consecrated by Pope Hadrian as bishop in the see of S. Andronicus in Pannonia. Since Pannonia had belonged to the diocese of Salzburg in earlier times Methodius was invited to an assembly to explain why he was infringing the rights of the other diocese. Although he defended himself bravely he was imprisoned for two and a half years in Swabia. In 873 he was freed by the intervention of Pope John VIII, but he could not return for a long time owing to the action of the German clergy who, by the use of threats, compelled Kocel not to keep him. Hearing this the Slavonic population in Moravia, who knew Methodius well, expelled the German clergy and asked the Pope to send them Methodius as Slavonic teacher and bishop. The Pope granted this request and Methodius received a great welcome on his return; and he continued his missionary work with great success.

According to the *Vita S. Clementis* Methodius went directly to Moravia and began his evangelising work as soon as he was consecrated bishop. Yet after this statement the author, in his absurdity and ignorance, affirms that Methodius began to instruct the three princes Rostislav,<sup>48</sup> Kocel and Boris at the same time, and that he even baptised Boris. According to him the Bulgarians accepted Christianity in 869.<sup>49</sup> In spite of these inconsistencies Theophylact faithfully portrays the strained relations between

<sup>47</sup> It is impossible to decide how large was his diocese.

<sup>48</sup> Methodius was bishop during the reign of Svatopluk.

<sup>49</sup> He had taken this material from a Bulgarian source. The commonly accepted date of this event is 864-865.



Svatopluk, of whom it is said that he succeeded Rostislav, and Methodius. Other historical evidence <sup>50</sup> implies that Svatopluk despised Slavonic as a language of the masses and supported the German clergy with their tradition of western culture.<sup>51</sup>

Unfortunately in the *Vita S. Methodii* very little is said of this period. To the German clergy of the diocese of Salzburg Methodius appeared as an intruder who not only celebrated the liturgy in a barbarous tongue but also, as an eastern Christian, would not accept the Filioque clause.<sup>52</sup> The Pannonian legend mentions only the second accusation and states that the German clergy made use of this fact in preparing their opposition to the Slavonic Archbishop. The leader of the opposition was the suffragan of Methodius—Bishop Wiching of Nitra. It is related that one day the people were gathered together in order to listen to a papal letter which, it was expected, would demand the expulsion of Methodius and his disciples from the diocese; but conversely, to the joy of all the people the orthodoxy of Methodius was affirmed. This may refer to the letter of Pope John VIII to Svatopluk which was sent after he had interviewed Methodius in Rome concerning the charges brought against him. In this letter of 880 the orthodoxy of Methodius was established and permission was granted for the use of the Slavonic liturgy. Two years later Methodius was invited by the Eastern Emperor to Constantinople, and the old Archbishop went to see Basil and his friend Photius. He received a very warm welcome and the Emperor kept one of his priests and deacons with some Slavonic books in Byzantium. This was probably intended for Boris and the other Slavs.

Arriving back in Moravia Methodius realised that his strength was failing and he chose Gorazd as his successor, because he knew Latin well, was a native and his views were orthodox.

After describing the relationship between Svatopluk and Methodius, Theophylact tells us that the old bishop foresaw his death and gathered his disciples together for a farewell. He represents

<sup>50</sup> The letters of Pope John VIII and Pope Stephan VI to Svatopluk.

<sup>51</sup> Exactly the opposite view is taken by E. E. Golubinsky (*Sviety . . . op. cit.*, pp. 66–67), who believes that throughout his life Svatopluk remained a defender of the Slavonic cause and his relations to Methodius and his disciples remained cordial until his death. According to the same writer the Slavonic liturgy was destroyed only later by the Magyar invasion. In taking this view he seems to ignore the evidence of the *Vita S. Clementis*, *Vita S. Naoum*, the letters of Pope John VIII and especially that of Stephen VI to Svatopluk. If this extremist view is accepted then the existence of Clement as a historical personality and a disciple of Methodius is placed in considerable doubt.

<sup>52</sup> It was introduced by the German hierarchy at the end of the 8th century and officially approved for use in Moravia by Stephen VI in the 9th century.

Methodius as delivering a long speech made up of many quotations from the Bible. He affirms the evidence of the Pannonian legend that Methodius left Gorazd as his successor with two hundred pupils. Methodius died in 885. The Pannonian legend states that his burial service was in Latin, Greek and Slavonic, and that he was buried in his cathedral in the presence of a great number of his flock.

Whilst Methodius was alive the Slavonic cause was maintained because of his great personality and in spite of opposition. After his death the position changed. The German clergy took the upper hand and they succeeded in persuading the new Pope Stephen V to take their side. He sent a letter to Svatopluk<sup>53</sup> forbidding the Slavonic liturgy despite the previous decision of John VIII. The Slavonic language was to be allowed for use only extra-liturgically for the edification of the simple folk. In his letter he also defended the German point of view concerning the Filioque clause.

It is a pity that the crucial question of the use of the Slavonic liturgy is hardly mentioned in the *Vita S. Clementis*, where the whole attention is concentrated on the Filioque clause.<sup>54</sup>

The place of Gorazd was taken by Wiching. After describing the character of the latter the author relates a long public dispute between the German clergy and the disciples of Methodius. Gradually Svatopluk also becomes involved in this argument. The main spokesmen on the Slavonic side are Gorazd and Clement. But the maintenance of the Slav cause was doomed. The state supported the Latin church and three Papal legates came to complete the latinisation of the Moravian church. The seed which the two brothers had sown with such high expectation had fallen among tares, and it was choked before it could bear its full fruit. Severe persecution began and Theophylact tells us that some of the pupils of Methodius were tortured and others sold to the Jews; <sup>54a</sup> but the leaders Gorazd,

*Κλήμης πρεσβύτερος, ἀνὴρ λογιώτατος*

(Clement, a priest and a most learned man),

Laurentius, Nahum, Angelarius and others were imprisoned. Not long after, however, in accordance with the Pope's letter to Svatopluk—concerning those who had disobeyed his order on the Slavonic liturgy—they were taken by soldiers and banished from the country.

The third part of the *Vita S. Clementis* (Ch. 15–29) is concerned

<sup>53</sup> *Patr. Lat.*, V. 129, c. 801–4.

<sup>54</sup> As a matter of fact the greater part of the Papal letter is concentrated on this point.

<sup>54a</sup> And taken to Venice (see above, pp. 186 and 200).

entirely with Clement.<sup>55</sup> The whole story of his life reads like an historical narrative. The chief source of Theophylact is a Slavonic *Vita S. Clementis* which is particularly evident in the "we" passages. Much of the evidence is corroborated by the Slavonic *Vita S. Naoum*.

We learn from the story that Clement takes Nahum<sup>56</sup> and Angelarius with him and goes to Bulgaria.<sup>57</sup> It was only natural that they should choose this country. It was the nearest country to Moravia, whose Christianity was closely connected with Byzantium whence their master had originally been sent to evangelise the Slavs. Moreover, if Clement's origin is to be sought in south Macedonia<sup>58</sup> then he was returning to his own country. Crossing the Danube they presented themselves to the governor (*Βοριτακάνος*)<sup>59</sup> of Belgrade and told him their life story. He immediately realised their importance for Boris and after a short stay he sent them to his master. Boris welcomed them with joy, for they were the people he needed so much. He gave them clerical garments and placed Clement and Nahum in the house of Ekbatch (*ἐχάτζης*),<sup>60</sup> the *samses*, and Angelarius with another Bulgarian noble Tcheslav. Angelarius soon died, and so was unable to enjoy this good hospitality.

Boris was delighted by their company and spent much time with them. The nobles followed his example and asked them many questions. We are not told how long Clement remained; but it could not have been long before Boris, a shrewd diplomat, sent him to Macedonia, about 886. Boris must have had several reasons for doing this, since if he had introduced the Slavonic liturgy into the capital and established a large educational centre there he would

<sup>55</sup> An interesting account of his work is found in F. Dvorník (*op. cit.*), pp. 312-18.

<sup>56</sup> It is shown very clearly in the *Vita S. Naoum* that Nahum throws in his lot with Clement.

<sup>57</sup> We are told nothing about the direction in which Laurentius and the others travelled.

<sup>58</sup> This seems to be the most satisfactory view. If Clement had been Moravian then with his great learning he would have been made the successor to Methodius. Moreover in the *Vita S. Clementis* it is said that he accompanied Methodius from his youth, in which case the master, when he was Archon over the Slav community in Macedonia, must have chosen him as a disciple. Clement's perfect knowledge of the Slav language, exhibited in his works, tends to confirm his Slav origin although the possibility of Greek birth must not be excluded. In the *Vita S. Clementis* we can find no facts about his early life. In the shorter life of Clement it is said that he is from "*ἐκ τῶν εὐρωπαϊων Μυσῶν*"—the European Mæsiens whom the writer identifies with the Bulgarians. For alternative theories see F. Dvorník (*op. cit.*), p. 314, n. 2.

<sup>59</sup> A very ingenious suggestion for the solution of this puzzling word has been given by S. Runciman in *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*, p. 126, n. 1: *Βοριτακάνω τῷ τότε φυλασσοντι.*" ("Boritanus must, I think, be the Tarkan (provincial governor) Boris").

<sup>60</sup> Moscow MS., "*ἐσχάτζης*."

have raised opposition both among the Greek clergy and the Bulgarian boyars at the court. It is true that Byzantium officially did not oppose the Slavonic liturgy; but this was not the case with the Greek clergy in Bulgaria. From the monk Khrabr we learn that the heresy of the three tongues existed also in Bulgaria. That there were still boyars who opposed the Slav policy of Boris is seen from the events which caused the fall of Vladimir—the elder son of Boris. By sending Clement to Macedonia Boris hoped, by means of Christianity, fully to absorb these Slavs into the Bulgarian kingdom. At that time they were nominally under Bulgaria, but in the event of a weak central authority they could turn to Byzantium, especially as they were favourably disposed towards the Christian faith. Far from the court and the Greek Archbishop, Clement could work in peace and develop his—in some ways—experimental task. And Boris did everything to make it successful.

Θεοῦ τὸν λογισμὸν τοῦτον ὑποβαλόντος αὐτῷ, διαιρεῖ μὲν τὴν Κουτμιτζιβίτζαν <sup>61</sup> ἐκ τοῦ Κοτοκίου, <sup>62</sup> προῖστᾶ δὲ ἀντὶς Δοβετᾶν <sup>63</sup> παραλυσας αὐτὸν τῆς διοικήσεως, <sup>64</sup> παραδίδωσι δὲ τῷ Δοβετᾷ τὸν μακάριον Κλήμεντα, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸν Δοβετᾶν Κλήμεντι, ἣ τό γε ακριβέστερον εἰπεῖν. <sup>65</sup>

(God having inspired him with this intention, he divided Kutmitchevitza from Kotokion and put Dobeta in charge of it, relieving him of the administration; and furthermore he entrusted the blessed Clement to Dobeta or rather, to speak more accurately, Dobeta to Clement.)

The exact relation between Clement and Dobeta is not quite clear. Most probably Dobeta was subordinate to Clement and his task was chiefly to help him in civil matters, so that the Slavonic teacher could concentrate on teaching and preaching. He was given

<sup>61</sup> Moscow MS., “Κουτμιτζιβίτζα” and also “Κουτμιντζίνα.” This name is not mentioned in any other document. Prof. Zlatarski (*op. cit.*, p. 226, n. 2) accepts “Κουτμιτζιβίτζα,” spelt “Kutmitchevitza,” as the form most appropriate to the Bulgarian language.

<sup>62</sup> Another term not met elsewhere. N. L. Tunitsky (*op. cit.*, p. 183, n. 2) considers it as an adaptation of “Κατωτικός—Κατωκος—Κατοκος”—thus it is either identical with “Κατωτικά μερη” and designates the southern part of the Balkan peninsula or as a place inhabited by a rough people, i.e. the Slavs. Runciman (*op. cit.*, p. 128, n. 1), thinks that “Κατοκίου” is an adaptation of “Κατοικία”—a colony. It is generally accepted that it is a term designating Macedonia.

<sup>63</sup> Moscow MS., “Δομετᾶν.”

<sup>64</sup> Dobeta, probably in charge of the whole of Kotokion, was specially attached to Clement and thus put in charge of the smaller district. This meaning is strengthened if we translate “τῆς διοικήσεως” as “from the diocese”. Even so the passage is not very clear. Moscow MS. gives: παραλυσας τὸν οὐτρον τῆς διοικήσεως.” Zlatarski (*op. cit.*, p. 229, n. 2) sees in “οὐτρον” a proper Bulgarian name “Οὐτρος—Χούτρος—Κουτρος—Κούτρος.” Thus “recalling Κούτρος (Kurt) from the administration.” Runciman (*op. cit.*, p. 128) suggests that the best solution is “Οὐτρον” as a Bulgarian proper name, but doubts whether one can assume emphatically that it is the name Kurt.

<sup>65</sup> Patr. Gr., *ibid.*, c. 1224.

three beautiful houses in Devol (*ἐν Διαβόλει*), apparently for his educational projects, and two places at Ochrida and Glavititza (*Ἀχρίδα καὶ Γλαβενίτζαν*), where he could rest and pray. He was also strongly recommended by Boris to the local Slav population.

We do not know precisely into which district Clement went. We are told that Boris separated the smaller district of Kutmitchevitza from the large province of Kotokion. Since Devol, his place of residence, was not far from Ochrida, this district must have been near this town. Both Devol and Glavenitza are non-existent today; and although a great number of theories have been propounded as to the identification of these two places none has been satisfactorily proved. This fact makes it impossible to decide the size of the district of Kutmitchevitza.<sup>66</sup>

With everything already prepared for him, Clement began immediately on arrival his missionary work on a large scale. He went all over Kutmitchevitza preaching the gospel to those pagan Slavs who had not accepted Christianity, and he endeavoured to root out the pagan customs of the district. These pagans must have been very numerous. They had not been attached to Boris's kingdom for a very long time and they did not like their Asiatic administrators very much. But Clement did not forget his main task, which was the creation of a great Slav educational centre. He envisaged a scheme for classifying his pupils comparable to the present primary schools, the seminaries and the theological academies. In the primary schools he taught the children in different ways:

*τοῖς μὲν τὸν τῶν γραμμάτων χαρακτῆρα γνωρίζων, τοῖς δὲ τὸν τῶν γεγραμμένων νοῦν σαφηνίζων, ἄλλοις πρὸς τὸ γράφειν τὰς χεῖρας τυπῶν.*

(To some he taught the characters, to others he made clear the meaning of what was written and to others again he gave directions about writing.)<sup>67</sup>

He established a seminary in each diocese and the number of his pupils of all ages soon became very large.

<sup>66</sup> I. Snyegarov (*Bulgariskiat pervoouchitel Sv. Kliment Ochridski*, Godischnic na Bogoslavskia facultet, 1926-1927, p. 276) proposes the following boundaries which begin from the mouth of the river Semeni on the Adriatic Sea and follow its course north-east; then continue alongside the river Devol to river Shkumbi; from here the boundary once again runs between the rivers Mati and Black Drin; at the town of Dibra it turns eastwards to the mount Babuna and then south-eastwards to Lake Ostrovo, where it follows a westerly direction, passing Mount Grammos and river Viosa until it finally reaches the Adriatic. In other words the extreme south-west of Macedonia, at present in Yugoslavia, Greece and Albania.

For alternative suggestion see Dvornik (*op. cit.*), p. 315, n. 2.

<sup>67</sup> Patr. Gr., c. 1225.

ἔχων δὲ τινὰς ἐκλελεγμένους τῶν ἄλλων καθ' ἐκάστην ἐνορίαν οὖμενοὺν ὀλίγους (εἰς τρισχιλίους γὰρ καὶ πεντακοσίους ἡριθμοῦντο), τούτοις τὰ πλείω συνῆν, καὶ τὰς βαθυτέρας τῶν Γραφῶν ἀνεκάλυπτεν.<sup>67a</sup>

(He had certain chosen pupils in each region, these were not few since they numbered 3500, with them he lived more closely and he showed them the deeper places of the scriptures.)

These pupils were not only well grounded in their knowledge but they also served as examples of Christian piety in their lives. From amongst them were ordained priests, deacons, subdeacons and readers. In every diocese he had 300 pupils and these were freed from paying taxes to the state. It is probable that some of them went to other parts of the kingdom since the number was a little too large even for a big diocese.

Besides these students he had a group of disciples whom he kept very close to himself. In *Vita S. Clementis* one of them states :

ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς ταπεινοὺς καὶ ἀναξίους οἰκειοτέρους τῶν ἄλλων διὰ σπλάγγνα τῆς χρηστότητος ἐποιήσατο, καὶ πάντοτε συνῆμεν αὐτῷ πᾶσι παρακολουθοῦντες οἷς ἐπραττεν, οἷς ἔλεγεν, οἷς δι' ἀμφοτέρων ἐδίδασκεν.<sup>68</sup>

(Although we are lowly and unworthy, because of his love and goodness he made us more intimate with him than others and we were always with him, following him in everything that he did and said and in what he taught both in word and deed.)

These men worked as his assistants, particularly in the training of his great number of pupils. From amongst them were chosen the men for important posts. From the *Vita S. Naoum* we learn that both its author and Bishop Marko were disciples of Clement.

Clement spent seven years there as a teacher and in his eighth year (893) <sup>69</sup> Theophylact tells us erroneously that Boris died and equally inaccurately that he was succeeded by Vladimir, who reigned for four years, died and was succeeded by Simeon. From reliable western sources <sup>70</sup> we learn that in 893 Boris handed his kingdom over to his elder son Vladimir and went to a monastery to spend the rest of his life in prayer. But Vladimir proved to be an unworthy son, opposed Christianity (in which he was supported by some of the boyars), and thus attempted to destroy the great work of his father. Although in the monastery, Boris retained his interest in the affairs of the country, and in 899 he took off his monastic garb

<sup>67a</sup> Patr. Gr., c. 1225.

<sup>68</sup> Patr. Gr., c. 1225.

<sup>69</sup> This date is confirmed by the *Vita S. Naoum*.

<sup>70</sup> *Reginonis Prumiensis Chronicon Pertz.*, M.G.H.S.S. t. i. p. 580.

for a time and seized once again the reins of government. As a result of this he not only deposed Vladimir but also blinded and imprisoned him. He then called together a great assembly with representatives from all over the kingdom and installed on the throne his younger son Simeon. Professor Zlatarsky believes that on this occasion the Slavonic language was introduced both in the church and in the state.<sup>71</sup> After completing this task Boris returned to his monastery, where he died peacefully in 907.

By this time Clement had made for himself a national reputation. He had created and developed his educational centre through which began the process of the infusion of Byzantine Christian culture into the Slavs. Simeon appreciated his services and in the same year

*ἐπίσκοπος Δρεμβίτζα,*<sup>72</sup> ἦτοι Βελίτζας προβάλλεται, καὶ οὕτω δὴ Βουλγαρῶν γλώσσει πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος ὁ Κλήμης καθίσταται (Ch. xx.)

(He promoted him to be Bishop of Drembitsa and Belitsa, and thus Clement became the first Bulgarian-speaking bishop—*et sic Bulgaricæ linguæ Clemens primus constituitur episcopus.*)

Perhaps in the source of Theophylact it was “*Σηλόβενικη*” and he changed the term to “*Βουλγαρῶν.*”<sup>73</sup> S. Clement could not be called the first bishop in Bulgaria<sup>74</sup> but the first bishop who celebrated the liturgy in the Slavonic (Bulgarian) tongue.<sup>75</sup>

Theophylact tells us nothing about the whereabouts of Clement's see but it seems probable that this bishopric was specially created for Clement. There is much difference amongst scholars on this subject, but the right place to seek for its identification should be near to the place of his previous activity, i.e. in south-west Macedonia.<sup>76</sup>

As a bishop he continued to give his life to the service of his people who, according to Theophylact, were “unlettered,” “ignorant” and “like beasts.” He knew that he alone could do little in this direction, and he therefore devoted a good deal of his time to the uplifting of his clergy and to making the Divine service more beautiful. Nor did he forget the importance of the influence of personal example, and in this task he drew inspiration from the

<sup>71</sup> *Natziolizatzia na Bul. durjava i Tsurkva priez IX viek.*

<sup>72</sup> Moscow MS.

<sup>73</sup> In *Vita S. Naoum* it is said of Bishop Marko that he was the fourth bishop of the Slavonic tongue, having in mind S. Clement as the first.

<sup>74</sup> There were others sent in 870 by Ignatius.

<sup>75</sup> Or the first bishop with Slav (Bulgarian) origin. N. L. Tunitsky (*op. cit.*, p. 218).

<sup>76</sup> For various suggestions see F. Dvorník, p. 316, n. 1.



“great Methodius” whom he had known so intimately from his childhood.

Clement had to overcome innumerable difficulties, for his clergy although enthusiastic could not read Greek and collect material for their sermons. Thus he had to prepare sermons in clear and simple language for all festivals, so that they could be used by his priests to enlighten their parishioners. Among the sermons there were some in honour of S. Mary, John the Baptist, the prophets, martyrs, the Fathers and the angels.<sup>77</sup> He also composed many hymns and prayers. Since the Christians needed a place for their worship and meditation he built a church and a monastery.

As the father of his flock he was interested not only in their spiritual life but also in their material welfare. Since most trees in the district grew wild and bore very little fruit he brought good shoots from Greece and grafted them on to the native trees, thus showing his knowledge of the science of arboriculture.

Finally, having grown old and weak, he went to Simeon and begged to be released from his office so that he might spend the rest of his life in the monastery in meditation and communion with God.<sup>78</sup> He suggested that in his place a younger and more vigorous man should be appointed. Simeon was deeply distressed at this request, since Clement was the symbol of the new Slavonic church and hierarchy. He begged him to remain and Clement bowed to the will of the king. He went for a short while to his monastery in Ochrida where he fell ill and died in 916. He was buried in the very monastery that he himself had built. According to his will he left half of his possessions to the diocese and the other half to the monastery. The last chapter of the work ends with eloquent praise of Clement by Theophylact.

The significance of Clement for the Slavonic world is clearly demonstrated by the *Vita S. Clementis*. Although Cyril invented the script, he and his brother worked chiefly on translations, which at the beginning was naturally most important for laying the foundation on which later on was built the original Slavonic literature. The situation might have been different if Cyril had lived longer and there had been no disaster in Moravia. But as history took its course it fell to Clement to continue and develop the work of the

<sup>77</sup> Most of his works are dispersed in various Russian libraries and museums. I have not been able to discover whether the University of Sofia has been able to publish the reproduction of his literary work which was made in Russia in 1914.

<sup>78</sup> In this action of Clement, Prof. Zlatarsky (*Istoriya, op. cit.*, p. 401) sees an attempt by Simeon to make Clement a Bulgarian Patriarch. Since this would be uncanonical, Clement offered to resign and thus have no responsibility for such an action.

two brothers, not only in translating but in creating new literary works. Even more important was it that he, first among the Slavs, laid the foundations for the education of the masses. While in eastern Bulgaria academic work began to flourish under the patronage of Simeon, here in Macedonia the simple people were taught to read and write, and by means of their education enabled to understand the faith which transformed the world so radically. To a great extent it was due to Clement that the Slavs became the proud heirs and preservers of the fine Byzantine culture which, by giving political and religious institutions to the Slavs, put them on a level with the other civilised nations of the world.

METHODIE KUSSEFF.

*London.*